



## ***Texas Department of Insurance***

### ***Division of Workers' Compensation***

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## ***MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION***

### ***GENERAL INFORMATION***

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

CORPUS CHRISTI MEDICAL CENTER  
c/o HOLLOWAY & GUMBERT  
3701 KIRBY DRIVE, SUITE 1288  
HOUSTON TX 77098-3926

**Carrier's Austin Representative Box**  
01

**MFDR Date Received**  
June 20, 2008

#### **Respondent Name**

BRADFORD HOLDING COMPANY INC

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-08-6310-01

### ***REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "As required by law, Corpus Christi Medical Center billed its usual and customary charges for its services. The total sum billed was \$65,726.00...There was no on-site audit performed by the insurance carrier...Per Rule 134.401(c)(6) (A)(i) (iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%...the fees paid by Tristar Risk Management do not conform to the reimbursement section of Rule 134.401...In closing, it is the position of Corpus Christi Medical Center that all charges...are due and payment...under Texas law and the Rules of the Division..."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$32,049.45

### ***RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY***

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "This is a medical fee dispute arising from an inpatient hospital surgical admission, dates of service 06/29/2007 to 07/09/2007. Requestor billed a total of \$65,726.00 and carrier paid \$17,245.00. The Requestor asserts it is entitled to reimbursement in the amount of \$49,294.50, which is 75% of the total charges. Requestor has not shown entitlement to this alternative, exceptional method of calculating reimbursement and has not otherwise properly calculated the audited charges ...There is no evidence submitted by the hospital demonstrating that the services provided ...were unusually extensive...no evidence of 'complications, infections, or multiple surgeries'...Secondly, there is no evidence that the services...were unusually costly...Using the per diem method, this ten-day surgical admission qualifies for \$11,180.00...in reimbursement..."

**Respondent's Post-Appeal Supplemental Response:** "Respondent submits this Respondent's Post-Appeal Supplemental Response as a response to and incorporation of the Third Court of Appeals Mandate in Cause No. 03-07-00682-CV..."

**Responses Submitted by:** Flahive, Ogden & Latson

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 29 through July 9, 2007	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$32,049.45	\$0.00

## FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

### Background

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25 2008, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 Texas Register 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital for the date of admission in dispute.
  - Effective July 13, 2008, the Division's rule at former 28 Tex. Admin. Code § 134.401 was repealed. The repeal adoption preamble specified, in pertinent part: "Section 134.401 will continue to apply to reimbursements related to admissions prior to March 1, 2008." 33 TexReg 5319, 5220 (July 4, 2008). Former 28 Tex. Admin. Code § 134.401(a) (1) specified, in pertinent part: "This guidelines shall become effective August 1, 1997. The Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline (ACIHFG) is applicable for all reasonable and medically necessary medical and/or surgical inpatient services rendered after the Effective Date of this rule in an acute care hospital to injured workers under the Texas Workers' Compensation Act." 22 TexReg 6264, 6306 (July 4, 1997).
- The services in dispute were reduced / denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

  - 24TX – (24) – payment for charges adjusted. Charges are covered under a capitation agreement/managed care plan
  - 42TX - (42) – charges exceed our fee schedule or maximum allowable amount
  - Z612TX – this bill was reviewed in accordance with your Fee for Service contract with First Health.
  - P303TX – this contracted provider or hospital has agreed to reduce this charge below fee schedule or usual and customary charges for your business
  - Z710TX – the charge for this procedure exceeds the fee schedule allowance
  - ANSI45 – charges exceed your contracted/legislated fee agreement
  - ANSIW1 – workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment
  - ANSIW3 – additional payment made on appeal/reconsideration
  - ANSIW4 – no additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration

### Issues

- Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
- Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
- Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
- Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

### Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original medical dispute

resolution (MDR) submission, position or response as applicable. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (6) (A) (i) states "to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c) (6) (A) (v); therefore the audited charges equal \$65,726.00. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. The requestor in its position statement asserts that, "Per Rule 134.401(c)(6) (A)(i) (iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%..." The requestor presumes that it is entitled to the stop loss method of payment because the audited charges exceed \$40,000. As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 opinion rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually extensive services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (6).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds \$40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must **demonstrate** that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitutes unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (6).
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b)(2)(A) titled General Information states, in pertinent part, that "The basic reimbursement for acute care hospital inpatient services rendered shall be the lesser of:
  - (i) a rate for workers' compensation cases pre-negotiated between the carrier and the hospital;
  - (ii) the hospital's usual and customary charges; and
  - (iii) reimbursement as set out in section (c) of this section for that admission

In regards to a pre-negotiated rate, the services in dispute were reduced in part with the explanation "Z612TX – this bill was reviewed in accordance with your Fee for Service contract with First Health." Coventry Health Care submitted a copy of a contract between First Health Group Corp. and the CCN Network and Corpus Christi Medical Center; however, no documentation was provided to support that a reimbursement rate was negotiated between the workers' compensation insurance carrier Bradford Holding Co and Corpus Christi Medical Center prior to the services being rendered; therefore 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b) (2) (A) (i) does not apply.

In regards to the hospital's usual and customary charges in this case, review of the medical bill finds that the health care provider's usual and customary charges equal \$65,726.00.

In regards to reimbursement set out in (c), the division determined that the requestor failed to support that the services in dispute are eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement; therefore 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1), titled Standard Per Diem Amount, and §134.401(c)(4), titled Additional Reimbursements, apply. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c) (4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c) (6) of this section.

- Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (3) (ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per

Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission.” The length of stay was ten days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of ten days results in an allowable amount of \$11,180.00.

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (4) (C), states “Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time.” A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$733.00/unit for Vancomycin 1g/d5w 200C and \$273.00/unit for Amidate 40mg amp. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (4) (A), states “When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274).” Review of the requestor’s medical bill finds that the following items were billed under revenue code 278 and are therefore eligible for separate payment under §134.401(c)(4)(A):

Rev Code	Itemized Statement Description	Cost Invoice Description	UNITS / Cost Per Unit	Total Cost	Cost + 10%
278	Cortical bone scr	3.5x12mm Cortical screw 3.5x20mm cortical screw 3.5x14mm cortical screw 3.5x16mm cortical screw 3.5x30mm cortical screw	4 @ \$21.39 1 @ \$27.90	\$85.56 \$27.90	\$94.12 \$30.69
278	Screw Cancellous type	4.0x40 solid canc lag	2 billed; however only 1 @ \$28.13 supported by invoice	\$28.13	\$30.94
278	30cc bone chips	Pro osteon 500R gran, 30cc, DOM	1 @ \$710.00	\$710.00	\$781.00
278	Plate bone LC-DCP 6H	8 hole tubular plate	1 @ \$56.26	\$56.26	\$61.89
TOTAL ALLOWABLE				\$998.64	

The total reimbursement set out in the applicable portions of (c) results in \$11,180.00 + \$998.64, for a total of \$12,178.64.

Reimbursement for the services in dispute is therefore determined by the lesser of:

§134.401(b)(2)(A)	Finding
(i)	Not Applicable
(ii)	\$65,726.00
(iii)	\$12,178.64

The division concludes that application of the standard per diem amount and the additional reimbursements under §134.401(c) (4) represents the lesser of the three considerations. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$17,245.05. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, the division concludes that the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement, that a pre-negotiated rate does not apply, and that application of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (1), titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c) (4), titled *Additional Reimbursements*, results in the total allowable reimbursement. Based upon the documentation submitted, the

requestor's Table of Disputed Services, and reimbursement made by the respondent, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

### **ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

#### **Authorized Signature**

_____	_____	_____
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution	Date

April 24, 2013

### **YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**